

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

**OCT 12 2007**

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

MEHRDAD ROKNI,

Petitioner,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,\*\* Acting Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-73293

Agency No. A22-597-821

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted August 10, 2007\*\*\*

Before: FARRIS, BOOCHEVER, and LEAVY, Circuit Judges.

Mehrdad Rokni, a native and citizen of Iran, petitions for review of the  
decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) affirming the decision of the

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent  
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as  
Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

\*\*\* This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without  
oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

immigration judge (IJ) denying his application for asylum, withholding of deportation, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review the BIA order for substantial evidence and will uphold the BIA's determination unless the evidence compels a contrary result. Molina-Estrada v. INS, 293 F.3d 1089, 1093 (9th Cir. 2002). We deny the petition.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's determination that Rokni's past experiences do not rise to the level of persecution. "[P]ersecution is an extreme concept that does not include every sort of treatment our society regards as offensive." Ghaly v. INS, 58 F.3d 1425, 1431 (9th Cir. 1995).

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's determination that Rokni does not have a well-founded fear of persecution if he returned to Iran. See Fisher v. INS, 79 F.3d 955, 964 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc). Rokni testified and submitted documents to support his claim of a well-founded fear. The IJ and BIA did not find Rokni's testimony or the documents incredible. Rather, the documents were given little weight because they were not authenticated and did not indicate the reasons why the Iranian authorities were interested in Rokni upon his return. The evidence does not compel a reversal of the BIA's determination. Id.

Because Rokni failed to establish eligibility for asylum, he has necessarily failed to meet the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. See Movsisian v. Ashcroft, 395 F.3d 1095, 1097 (9th Cir. 2005). Rokni has also failed to meet the standard for CAT relief. See Farah v. Ashcroft, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 2003); Kamalthas v. INS, 251 F.3d 1279, 1284 (9th Cir. 2001).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**